

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

STEPHANIE L. PICKERING and TERRY A.  
O'KEEFE,

Case No. C15-1983 RSM

Plaintiffs,

ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT  
QUALITY LOAN SERVICE  
CORPORATION OF WASHINGTON'S  
MOTION TO DISMISS

## BANK OF AMERICA HOME LOANS, *et al.*,

## Defendants.

## I. INTRODUCTION

This matter comes before the Court on Defendant Quality Loan Service Corporation of Washington (“QLS”)’s Second Motion to Dismiss pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6). Dkt. #26. QLS argues that Plaintiffs’ Amended Complaint fails to allege any facts to support the claims brought against QLS and thus fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. Plaintiffs oppose this Motion. Dkt. #29. For the reasons set forth below, the Court agrees with Defendant QLS and GRANTS its Second Motion to Dismiss with prejudice.

## II. BACKGROUND<sup>1</sup>

The Court need not recite all the facts of the case for purposes of this Motion and will focus on the facts related to movant OLS.

<sup>1</sup> Except as otherwise noted, the following background facts are taken from Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint, Dkt. #22, and accepted as true for purposes of ruling on this Motion to Dismiss.

1 Plaintiffs Stephanie L. Pickering and Terri A. O'Keefe bring this action against  
2 Defendants Bank of America Home Loans, Bank of America, N.A., QLS, Mortgage Electronic  
3 Registration System ("MERS") and Does 1-10 under several causes of action for mishandling  
4 of Plaintiffs' loan modification application. Dkt. #22.

5 Plaintiffs' original Complaint was filed on December 16, 2015. Dkt. #1. On March 3,  
6 2016, Defendant QLS filed a Motion nearly identical to the instant Motion, seeking dismissal  
7 of claims against it under Rule 12(b)(6). Dkt. #10. On May 26, 2016, the Court granted QLS'  
8 Motion, dismissed Plaintiffs' claims against QLS without prejudice, and granted Plaintiffs  
9 leave to amend their Complaint to rectify the factual deficiencies described in the Order. Dkt.  
10 #18. Plaintiffs filed their Amended Complaint on June 16, 2016. Dkt. #22.

11 Plaintiffs allege in their Amended Complaint that they executed a negotiable  
12 promissory note and a security interest in the form of a deed of trust in the amount of \$210,000  
13 in favor of Golf Savings Bank/JP Morgan Chase in July of 2008. *Id.* at 6. Plaintiffs refinanced  
14 and executed a negotiable promissory note and a security interest in the form of a Deed of Trust  
15 in the amount of \$207,000 to Defendant Bank of America Home Loans. Plaintiffs experienced  
16 financial difficulties and appear to have defaulted on their mortgage in July of 2011. *Id.*  
17 Plaintiffs contacted Defendant Bank of America, N.A. and requested mortgage assistance,  
18 instead they entered into a "Special Forbearance Agreement." *Id.* at 7. Plaintiffs allege that  
19 they satisfied this agreement and qualify for a loan modification. *Id.* Instead, Bank of America  
20 N.A. "is threatening foreclosure" and state that Plaintiffs owe \$72,769.02. *Id.* at 8.

21 The Amended Complaint asserts that QLS "is a trustee service." *Id.* at 3. The  
22 Amended Complaint goes on to state under its Violation of Fair Debt Collection Practices Act  
23 ("FDCPA") cause of action that QLS "does not have the authority to collect payments and or  
24

1 threaten to foreclose on Plaintiff's real property," but has "schedule[d] a Trustee sale date of  
 2 January 29, 2016 despite their lack of authority to do so." *Id.* at 11. Plaintiffs fail to allege any  
 3 other facts specifically related to QLS in their Amended Complaint.

4 **III. DISCUSSION**

5 **A. Legal Standard**

6 In making a Rule 12(b)(6) assessment, the court accepts all facts alleged in the  
 7 complaint as true, and makes all inferences in the light most favorable to the non-moving party.  
 8 *Baker v. Riverside County Office of Educ.*, 584 F.3d 821, 824 (9th Cir. 2009) (internal citations  
 9 omitted). However, the court is not required to accept as true a "legal conclusion couched as a  
 10 factual allegation." *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Bell Atl. Corp. v.*  
 11 *Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)). The complaint "must contain sufficient factual matter,  
 12 accepted as true, to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face." *Id.* at 678. This  
 13 requirement is met when the plaintiff "pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the  
 14 reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged." *Id.* The  
 15 complaint need not include detailed allegations, but it must have "more than labels and  
 16 conclusions, and a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do."  
 17 *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555. Absent facial plausibility, a plaintiff's claims must be dismissed.  
 18 *Id.* at 570.

22 **B. Request for Judicial Notice**

23 As an initial matter, QLS asks the Court to take judicial notice of certain public records  
 24 outside the pleading materials. Dkt. #26 at 2 (citing *Chapel v. Mortg. Elec. Registration Sys.*,  
 25 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 143524, \*6-7 (W.D. Wash. Nov. 2, 2010) ("the Court may take judicial  
 26 notice of public records when considering a 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss"). These documents  
 27  
 28

1 are listed as: Deed of Trust, recorded 4/30/2009 under Skagit County Auditor instrument  
 2 number 200904300138; Assignment of Deed of Trust in favor of Bank of America, N.A.,  
 3 recorded 11/3/2011 under Skagit County Auditor instrument number 201111030055;  
 4 Appointment of Successor Trustee appointing Quality Loan Service Corporation of  
 5 Washington, recorded 8/6/2015 under Skagit County Auditor instrument number  
 6 201508060023; and Notice of Trustee's Sale, recorded 10/1/2015 under Skagit County auditor  
 7 number 201510010057. *Id.* at 3. These documents are attached to the Motion at Dkt. #26-1.  
 8 The Court finds that it need not examine these documents to reach the ruling below and will  
 9 defer its ruling.

10

11 **C. Factual Amendments to Complaint**

12 QLS begins by arguing:

13  
 14 The Amended Complaint runs twenty (20) pages, containing no  
 15 assertion of fact as to any specific conduct of QLS. Indeed, absent  
 16 a statement conceding QLS' status as a trustee service that  
 17 operates, and therefore has a presence in the State of Washington,  
 18 there is no reference at all to QLS in the alleged facts. The only  
 19 allegation against QLS is found within a listed cause of action in  
 20 paragraph 29, which is word-for-word identical to the same sole  
 21 allegation against QLS in the initial complaint. Within this  
 22 paragraph, Plaintiff makes a conclusory assertion that QLS did not  
 23 have authority to collect payments or threaten to foreclose on  
 24 property, and that QLS scheduled a Trustee's Sale lacking  
 25 authority. As QLS's motion to dismiss was granted based upon  
 26 Plaintiffs' failure to assert these basic factual allegations, Plaintiffs  
 27 have failed to cure the defect that was fatal to their initial  
 28 complaint.

Dkt. #26 at 2.

Plaintiffs respond with a brief identical to previous brief responding to QLS' Motion to Dismiss, with the addition of section "C" addressing whether leave to amend should be granted again. *See* Dkt. ##11, 29. Plaintiffs' brief even includes the same fragment sentence on page 6, "Defendant QLS have conducted abusive collection practices towards," Dkt. #29 at 6, pointed

1 out in the Court's prior Order. Plaintiffs fail to respond to QLS' point above—that there are no  
 2 new factual assertions correcting the deficiencies noted by the Court's prior Order.

3 On Reply, QLS makes the same arguments as its prior Reply in support of its prior  
 4 Motion to Dismiss. Dkt. #30. QLS also argues that Plaintiffs' Response "appears to be nearly  
 5 identical, verbatim, to their previous opposition to Defendant QLS's Motion to Dismiss,  
 6 introducing no new legal arguments whatsoever." *Id.* at 3. QLS concludes with the following:  
 7

8 Plaintiffs allege that this Court should look to the substance of  
 9 their complaint rather than the form. Fatal to their argument,  
 10 though, is that their Amended Complaint contains no substantial  
 11 allegations against QLS whatsoever; indeed, their Amended  
 12 Complaint contains even fewer factual allegations as to QLS than  
 13 their initial Complaint. As Plaintiffs have failed to avail themselves  
 14 of their opportunity to cure the paucity of facts alleged in their  
 15 initial Complaint, which resulted in its dismissal, this Court should  
 16 not grant them a third opportunity.

17 *Id.* at 6.

18 The Court agrees and finds that Plaintiffs have failed to adequately amend their  
 19 Complaint to address the factual deficiencies described in the Court's prior Order, Dkt. #18.  
 20 Plaintiffs add no new factual background linking QLS to the causes of action against it, instead  
 21 relying on insufficient "labels and conclusions" and "formulaic recitation of the elements of a  
 22 cause of action," which previously failed and continue to fail to meet the Rule 12(b)(6)  
 23 standard. *See* Dkt. #18 (setting forth grounds to dismiss these same claims); *Twombly*, 550  
 24 U.S. at 555. Accordingly, all of Plaintiffs' claims against Defendant QLS must be dismissed.

#### 25 **D. Request for Attorney's Fees**

26 The Court notes that QLS again requests an award of attorney's fees "pursuant to the  
 27 underlying Deed of Trust." Dkt. #30 at 6. No further explanation or analysis is offered. The  
 28

1 Court will deny this request at this time and direct Defendant QLS to file a separate Motion for  
2 Attorney's Fees setting forth the legal arguments and factual support for such a Motion.

3 **E. Leave to Amend**

4 Where a complaint is dismissed for failure to state a claim, "leave to amend should be  
5 granted unless the court determines that the allegation of other facts consistent with the  
6 challenged pleading could not possibly cure the deficiency." *Schreiber Distrib. Co. v. Serv-*  
7 *Well Furniture Co.*, 806 F.2d 1393, 1401 (9th Cir. 1986).

8 Plaintiffs argue in Section C of their Response that "[a] pro se plaintiff's pleadings and  
9 filings are liberally construed and are held to a less stringent standard than documents drafted  
10 by attorneys." *Id.* at 8 (citing *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007); *Hamilton v. Brown*,  
11 630 F.3d 889, 893 (9th Cir. 2011)). Even holding Plaintiffs to this less stringent standard, given  
12 Plaintiffs' inability to cure the factual deficiencies identified in the Court's prior Order, the  
13 Court finds that further amendment could not possibly cure the deficiency and that leave to  
14 amend is not warranted.

15 **IV. CONCLUSION**

16 Having reviewed the relevant pleadings, the declarations and exhibits attached thereto,  
17 and the remainder of the record, the Court hereby finds and ORDERS:

18 1) Defendant Quality Loan Service Corporation of Washington's Motion to Dismiss  
19 (Dkt. #26) is GRANTED.  
20  
21 2) Plaintiffs' claims against QLS are dismissed with prejudice.  
22  
23 3) Defendant Quality Loan Service Corporation of Washington may file a Motion for  
24 Attorney's Fees, setting forth the legal and factual basis for those fees, no later than  
25  
26 **fourteen (14) days** from the date of this Order. This Motion shall be limited to five  
27  
28

1 (5) pages and supported by documentary evidence reflecting the amount of fees  
2 sought. Plaintiffs may file a Response no later than the noting date of Defendant's  
3 Motion and this Response shall be limited to five (5) pages. No Reply is permitted.  
4  
5

6 DATED this 18<sup>th</sup> day of August 2016.  
7  
8



9 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
10 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28